



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1459 P.O. Box 1459 Www.usungb.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,984	0:	8/04/2003	Dennis J. White		2981	
45986	7590	11/04/2004		EXAM	INER	
DENNIS J. 17 NOSTRA)	MANAHAN	MANAHAN, TODD E		
CRANBUR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3732	٠.	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Anniination No	[Analianata)					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summan	10/632,984	WHITE, DENNIS J.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
TI MANUNO DATE (III)	Todd E. Manahan	3732					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Au	<u>igust 2004</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This	<u>_</u>						
 Since this application is in condition for allowar 	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) 3-7 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-7</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Gee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office							

Application/Control Number: 10/632,984

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment to the abstract filed on 05 August 2004 does not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(h) because it was not filed on as a separate paper and therefore has not been entered. Amendments filed on or after July 30, 2003 must comply with 37 CFR 1.121(h) which states:

(h) Amendment sections. Each section of an amendment document (e.g., amendment to the claims, amendment to the specification, replacement drawings, and remarks) must begin on a separate sheet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The impression tray being formed of plastic, the outer walls being short and the connecting member being thin so as to accommodate dual arch impression technique was not originally disclosed in the application as filed. As such, this constitutes new matter, which is not permitted.

Double Patenting

Applicant is advised that should claim 3 be found allowable, claim 5 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains "means" and further is not directed to the technical nature of the invention but rather to the purported merits thereof.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Psayla (United States Patent No. 1,652,910).

Psayla discloses a dental impression tray comprising an outer wall 14 of deformable, non-memoric characteristics (cellulous), and inner wall 6 comprising at least one break, and a connecting member between the walls and also including at least one break. The inner and outer walls are arranged in a generally horseshoe shape. Regarding claim 2, the tray is made of two

sections 1,2 comprised of inner and outer walls connected by a base with the outer walls adjustably connecting the sections end to end.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05 August 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., tray being one piece) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to Applicant's argument that Psayla includes additional structure not required by Applicant's invention, it must be noted that Psayla discloses the invention as claimed. The fact that it discloses additional structure not claimed is irrelevant.

In response to applicant's arguments of "Unexpected Results", "Long Felt Need", and "Commercial Success", applicant has not provided any evidence in support of these allegations. Furthermore, such "secondary considerations" may be relevant to show non-obviousness, however they are not applicable to the law of anticipation. Anticipation "does not require that a reference 'teach' what the subject patent teaches;...it is only necessary that the claims under attack, as construed by the court, 'read on' something disclosed in the reference." Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp. 218 USPQ 781 (CCPA 1983).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/632,984

Art Unit: 3732

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd E. Manahan whose telephone number is 703 308-2695. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 703 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on ascess to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 265-311-9197 (foll-free).

Todd E. Manahan Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732